

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

NEW YORK, NEW YORK
DENVER, COLORADO

ARNOLD & PORTER

1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-6885

(202) 872-6700

CABLE: "ARFOPO"

FACSIMILE: (202) 872-6720

TELEX: 89-2733

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

TOKYO, JAPAN

WILLIAM E. COOK, JR.
DIRECT LINE: (202) 872-6996

October 19, 1994

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1994

BY HAND DELIVERY

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room 222
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: Ex Parte Presentation in
MM Docket Nos. 92-266 and 93-215

Dear Mr. Caton:

Pursuant to the Commission's ex parte rule, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, an original and one copy of this letter are being filed in MM Docket Nos. 93-215 and 92-266 as notification that representatives of the National Association of Telecommunication Officers and Advisors ("NATOA") had a conference call on Tuesday, October 18, 1994, with Mary McManus, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Ness, to discuss the proposals under consideration regarding the cable rate regulation going forward rules.

On behalf of NATOA, the following representatives participated in the call: Ms. Susan Littlefield, President of NATOA and Cable Regulatory Administrator for the City of St. Louis, MO; Ms. Eileen Huggard, a member of the NATOA Board of Directors and the Assistant Commissioner, Cable Television Franchises and Policy, Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications, the City of New York; Mr. David Hankin, Assistant General Manager, Department of Telecommunications, City of Los Angeles, CA; Tim Lay, Esq., an attorney representing a number of local governments in rate regulation proceedings; John W. Pestle, Esq., an attorney representing a number of Michigan communities; and Stephanie Phillipps and myself, attorneys with the law firm of Arnold & Porter and

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

0+1

Mr. William F. Caton
October 19, 1994
Page 2

NATOA's special outside counsel on federal telecommunications matters.

NATOA representatives raised a number of questions and concerns regarding the proposal including how operators' revenues received from new programmers (e.g., revenues from home shopping channels) would be taken into account in determining the appropriate price cap; how the new proposal would be implemented; and how the new proposal would impact on the Form 1200s and Form 1210s. NATOA representatives expressed their concern that the effect of the proposal would be to increase rates for basic service programming that consumers may not want and wipe out any refunds and rate reductions that consumers may have received as a result of the rate regulation process. NATOA questioned the need for the FCC to act now and proposed that the FCC examine more closely evidence submitted by the cable industry and cable programmers that purports to show that new programs will not be distributed on cable systems unless the FCC grants operators some form of relief from rate regulation. NATOA pointed out that the evidence cited by the operators and programmers does not comport with other evidence showing that the problems new programmers have in getting their programs distributed on cable systems is the result of the monopoly power of cable operators, limited system capacity, operators' uncertainty regarding the new rate regulations, and other economic and practical reasons.

NATOA recommended that the Commission take steps to ensure that the rules do not result in unreasonable rates by, among other things, requiring that cable operators offset the price cap formula rate by the revenues cable operators receive from new programmers, and limiting future rate increases related to increases in the cost of such new programming services. Moreover, NATOA recommended that the Commission limit the "incubation" period during which cable operators may carry new services on existing programming service tiers at rates pursuant to the price cap formula.

NATOA also emphasized that local governments have exhausted their rate regulation budgets and are straining to cope with the revised rules that became effective on May 15, 1994. Additional new rules would further burden local governments' already limited resources. Such added


ARNOLD & PORTER

Mr. William F. Caton
October 19, 1994
Page 3

burdens may lead some local governments to decertify. NATOA suggested that the FCC take steps to ensure that such regulations do not burden franchising authorities, such as not applying the proposed rules to the basic service tier.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "William E. Cook, Jr.", is positioned above the typed name.

William E. Cook, Jr.

cc: Mary McManus,
Legal Advisor to Commissioner Ness